

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/527,629	03/17/2000	Roy P. DeMott	2168	3035
25280	7590 03/14/2003			
MILLIKEN & COMPANY 920 MILLIKEN RD PO BOX 1926			EXAMINER	
			BEFUMO, JENNA LEIGH	
SPARTANBURG, SC 29304		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1771	
			, DATE MAILED: 03/14/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•		_ AS-19				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/527,629	DEMOTT ET AL.				
•	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jenna-Leigh Befumo	1771				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 24 February 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 24 February 2003. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) ☑ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-12,24 and 25</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>16-23 and 26-34</u> .						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a	a) approved or b) disappr	oved by the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:						
		İ				

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed and and new limitations not previously considered, particularly using microdenier filaments which have a denier less than 1.1 denier.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant's argues that Schuette discloses applying the finish to the outside of the yarn, and it would not evenly penetrate to the fibers in the inner part of the yarn. Therefore, the Applicant argues that the pile would not be hydrophilic due to the exposed inner fibers which are not coated with the finish. However, the finish will penetrate into the inner fibers of the yarn to some degree, and those fibers will be hydrophilic to some degree. Therefore, the pile yarns after they are raised and brushed, will also be hydrophilic to some degree. Even though the pile fibers may not be evenly coated with the finish taught by Schuette, the fibers that are coated with the finish will be hydrophilic and thus the structure meets the limitation recited in claim 1. Therefore, the rejection is maintained. However, it is noted that the proposed amendment would be sufficient to overcome the rejection based on Scheller, since Scheller does not teach using microdenier fibers in the pile yarns.

TERREL MORRIS

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700